

Communities of Opportunity

Interim Governance Group

Meeting Notes

February 19, 2016 1:00-4:00pm

Location: 2100 Building, 2100 24th Avenue South. Seattle, WA 98144

Members Present:

Betsy Jones, Deanna Dawson (conference phone), Gordon McHenry, Hilary Franz, Jeff Natter, Michael Brown, Michael Woo, Paola Maranan, Patty Hayes, Scarlett Aldebot-Green, Sili Savusa, Tony To

Staff Present: *Aaron Robertson, Alice Ito, Bao-Tram Do, Cheryl Markham, Kirsten Wysen*

Guests:

Van Badzik (Facilitator)

Welcome

Michael Brown welcomed the Communities of Opportunity (COO) Interim Governance Group (IGG).

Update – Appointment of IGG Community Representatives

Betsy Jones and Scarlett Aldebot-Green announced the two new community appointees to the COO IGG: Ubax Gardheere and John Page.

Gardheere and Page's biographies were included in the pre-meeting materials. Gardheere and Page's confirmation hearing is on March 1, 2016. The new members will be introduced and on-boarded to the COO IGG.

Governance Process and Structure Decisions

Van Badzik facilitated the IGG's discussion of governance process and structure options. This included consideration of recommendations made by the IGG's Strategic Planning Subgroup and related information outlined in the draft document titled "COO Governance Working Paper."

COO IGG Decision-Making Process

The IGG discussed levels of agreement in relationship to a consensus decision-making process. Levels of agreement included:

- I can say an unqualified "yes."
- I can accept the decision.
- I can live with the decision.
- I do not fully agree with the decision; however, I will not block it and will support it.
- I cannot live with the decision and will block it.

The IGG agreed to use a consensus decision-making process for the remainder of the meeting, in which levels of agreement are indicated by using thumbs up, sideways or down. The IGG agreed that a group consensus decision could not be blocked by only one member. If a member strongly disagrees, there will be further discussion. Members who disagree with a decision were asked to offer a proposal or modification.

Consensus agreement can be reached minus one or two members. If three or more members disagree, there should be further discussion to reach consensus.

The following issues regarding COO governance were discussed and decisions were made by consensus agreement, as indicated below:

A. Consensus Decision Process

The IGG agreed that “consensus agreement” would be defined as up to two members in disagreement. That is, if three members of the Governance Group or more disagree, then consensus would not have been reached. If two or fewer members disagree, then consensus agreement would have been reached.

B. Size of Governance Group – Minimum 14, Maximum 18 members

C. Governance Group Member Composition

- IGG members expressed the intent of the COO’s collective impact purpose, principles, and values, and the importance of a membership composition which reflects different sectors and perspectives, and includes desired skills, expertise, and relationships that can benefit the governance and successful achievement of COO purpose and goals.
- IGG agreed that Governance Group will include two representatives of King County (one Executive appointment and one Council appointment); two representatives appointed by Seattle Foundation; and at least two representatives of site partnerships.
- Discussion regarding site partnership representatives emphasized that “at least two” allows opportunity for additional representatives of sites may be included in the Governance Group. It was agreed that further discussion is needed to develop processes for site partnerships to participate in assessing needs for representation on the Governance Group. The Strategic Planning Subgroup will discuss and suggest processes for consideration by the IGG.
- Consensus was reached on removing draft language regarding elected officials. No seats will be designated seats for elected officials; however, elected officials may be eligible for membership on the Governance Group, in accordance with the criteria, desired characteristics, and needs of the Governance Group.
- Consensus was reached on recruitment through governance group determination, process similar to how a board recruits, not an open application process.

D. Seat Allocation – Community seats and other seats: (majority community) OR Equal representation

- The IGG members expressed the desire to build a governance group with a composition of members that are fully committed to the goals of COO and can lend their values, background and expertise to help accomplish the priorities.
- Members expressed some concern about hard and fast percentages for community members and other members; the idea of “at least 50% community members that are not from large institutions/intermediaries” was discussed.
- Discussion on the definition of community appointees. Classifications of nonprofit organizations are included in the policy and systems change RFP.
- Discussion on the recruitment of grassroots leaders, and activists versus leaders from large nonprofit institutions. What is the role for representatives from large nonprofit institutions?
- Members referenced council amendment for allotted community appointee seats and mandate to broaden representation from Executive Directors. Governance group is aware and complies with process.

- Discussion on governance group members holding each other accountable to identify gaps in representative and inclusion.
 - Consensus that community appointees and nonprofit members should reflect the community and constituents that they represent (i.e., ethnically, geographically).
 - Consensus was researched that there should be a majority community seats in governance group. Value of changing power dynamics and creating a structure to ensure that conventional patterns of power do not resurface and business is done as usual.
- E. Chairs – Two Co-chairs; one founder rep and one other – community or rotation.
- There were no additional comments and consensus was reached.
- F. Term Lengths –Three year terms with 1/3 expiring every year (1/3 one year, 1/3 two year and 1/3 three year terms to start rotation); two terms maximum.
- Consensus was reached on the term lengths specifying “three year terms with 1/3 expiring every year (1/3 one year, 1/3 two year and 1/3 three year terms to start rotation); two terms maximum.”
- G. Term Lengths for COO Site Reps – At least two site representatives on the governance group with a term of at least one year and no more than three years.
- Consensus was reached with the recommendation to add language specifying term lengths for government appointees.
- H. Transition from IGG to Final GG – Transition Committee (TC) of IGG brings final recommendations to full IGG.
- Council process will be completed in June. COO IGG will need process to transition to GG by mid-May to present to council.
 - IGG group is developing governance structure; slate of GG member recommendations should reflect governance structure.
 - Members expressed concerns that slate of GG member recommendations will change depending on modifications made by council on proposed GG structure.
 - A transition committee will be formed.
- I. Vacancies – Other than appointed reps and site reps, GG to approve vacant seat replacements (either at end of term of when members can’t fulfill responsibilities)
- Staff introduced “Area of Expertise” document
 - Consensus that IGG will determine the process of transition and recruitment, letter of interest will not be required since it will not be an open process, GG recruitment and selection process will be similar to a board of directors, allowing for strategic identification.
 - Consensus that outlining expectations for membership and involvement is important for accountability but not using “removal” language, include language specifying “In the case that the expectations for membership cannot be met...” outline possible courses of action.
 - Discussion on framing the implication of absenteeism. If GG member is not present, the constituencies that he or she represents are not heard.
 - Follow-up on developing a charter for membership expectations.
- J. Decision Process – Consensus process preferred
- There were no additional comments and consensus was reached.

- K. Voting Process – Quorum One: Required seats for quorum for general governance decision: one SF, one KC, two community based reps; quorum of at least 50% of IGG. Quorum Two: Funding decisions where there are conflicts regarding governance group members who are applicants or otherwise conflicted and cannot participate in a decision; Required seats: one SF, one KC, one community rep (if one with no conflict); quorum = 50% of eligible decision makers.
- Consensus on quorum requirements outlined with specifications on no proxy votes but votes by extension are accepted.

Learning Community Concepts and Ideas for Implementation Planning

- Michael Brown introduced the idea of developing a Learning Community that enables COO to have a broader reach outside of current place-based and policy and system change investments.
- IGG reviewed “COO Strategic Planning Concept Paper” and “Learning Community Concept” diagram.

Discussion

- Bring in other cities and regions that have not received funding but can benefit from learnings, best practices, and relationships with COO grantee sites.
- Bridge place-based and policy systems change work.
- Work towards collective impact, amplify results, and build an ecosystem.
- Bring along planning sites and other places in communities experiencing disparate health & well-being outcomes in order to build their capacity for potential funding of resulted based strategies.
- Funded place-based sites can provide mentorship to planning sites and other sites, supporting infrastructure.
- Continue to support ramp up of place-based work, show what works and doesn't work.
- Resources to other places that can apply to the Learning Community for funding to move forward place-based strategies.
- Communities working towards similar COO outcomes do not need to reinvent the wheel. How can the model be replicated?
- Allows COO to connect efforts, initiatives, and investments from other funders, intermediaries and partners that want to engage.
- Connect groups and leverage work around COO content issues. For example, public health, Partnerships in Improving Community Health (PICH) grantees.
- Important for this model to be intentional (in focus area and time).
- Set atmosphere for collaboration, breaking down silos, way for groups to see interconnections, allow systems to interact.
- Recommendation that planning sites (Auburn and Skyway) be added to the concept diagram in a different color.
- Follow-up for strategic planning group to work on Learning Community concept and present to IGG in March.
- Recommendation to create a COO website that makes Learning Community concept document and other materials accessible. Good opportunity to document work and share stories.

IGG Business Items and Updates

- Cheryl Markham shared the updated RBA framework incorporating site implementation plans and Living Cities six-month report and Results Scorecard.
- Framework document was developed through RBA training and co-design meetings, not finalized.

- Recommendation to date documents to track drafts.
- Recommendation to add relevant indicators (e.g., transportation).
- Recommendation for an electronic map that has expanded information.

Warp Ups and Next Steps

- Clarity on definition of community member/representative.
- Follow-up on developing a charter for membership expectations.
- Patty will circulate information about PICH.
- Follow-up for strategic planning group to work on Learning Community concept and present to IGG in March. Find out what relationships are in place, bring key learning elements from other place-based initiatives, ask Learning Community partners for recommendations instead of assuming (reach out to Washington CAN, Skyway Solutions, Yesler Community Collaborative), look at timeline for planning grants sites.
- Will apply a “Blue sky” open approach to the Learning Community concept in next meeting.

IGG Meetings, Upcoming Events and Deadlines:

- Mar. 18, 2016; 1-4 p.m., Executive Conference Room (1st floor), 401 5th Ave, Seattle
- March 22-23, Living Cities Learning Community, Washington, DC
- Apr. 15, 2016; 2-4 p.m., Seattle Foundation
- May 20, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- June 17, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- July 15, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Aug. 19, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Sept 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Late September, Living Cities Learning Community, location TBD
- Oct. 21, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Nov. 18, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- Dec. 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.

Interim Governance Group Members:

1. Scarlett Aldebot-Green, King County Council
2. Michael Brown, The Seattle Foundation
3. Deanna Dawson, Sound Cities Association
4. David Fleming, PATH
5. Hilary Franz, Futurewise
6. Patty Hayes, Public Health-Seattle & King County
7. Betsy Jones, Executive's Office, King County
8. Paola Maranan, The Children's Alliance
9. Gordon McHenry, Jr, Solid Ground
10. Jeff Natter, Pacific Hospital PDA
11. Adrienne Quinn, King County Department of Community and Human Services
12. Sili Savusa, White Center CDA
13. Adam Taylor, Global to Local
14. Tony To, HomeSight
15. Michael Woo, volunteer